

LSC recognizes that many ideas could improve the law school's relationship with the legal services community, but may not fit in the above category. Thus, under the Innovative Clinical Programs Category, the Corporation encourages new and innovative approaches to legal services delivery that are not currently being provided by law school clinics or legal services programs. These innovative projects must show a close collaboration between the law school clinic and the legal services program. Such programs could be on either a local, state or national level. In addition, under this category, LSC is soliciting applications from law schools with an established mandatory pro bono program or seeking a substantial expansion of its voluntary pro bono program.

Eligibility: (1) All law schools and consortia of law schools that are currently accredited by the American Bar Association or accredited for purposes of bar admission by the state bar associations of the states in which the law schools are located are eligible to apply; (2) any LSC-funded legal services program is eligible to apply; and (3) any 501(c)(3) organization with the capability to oversee a summer fellowship program is eligible to apply.

No 1995-96 LSCCP grant funds, in any category, may be used to fund conferences or research projects. This limitation does not restrict funds being used for research related to representation or advocacy on behalf of eligible clients. The application should demonstrate that existing law school or legal services program support for law school clinical efforts will be continued, and that any LSC funds granted will be used solely for new or expanded operations.

### Awards Process

Grant proposals will be carefully evaluated by an advisory panel of peer reviewers from the law school community, the legal services community, the client community and LSC staff. Awards will be based on the merit of the proposal and the extent to which it meets the goals of the LSCCP. An applicant may submit a grant proposal for one category only.

### 1. Proposed Collaboration

The applicant should detail the proposed working relationship between the law school clinic and the legal services program that will be involved in the project. If such collaboration is not an aspect of the proposal, the applicant should detail the efforts that were made to secure such collaboration and why they were unsuccessful.

### 2. Project Goals and Objectives

The applicant should set forth the project's goals and objectives, which will be reviewed in terms of the quality of the proposed project, evidence of the client need to be served, and the long-term benefits to the organization and the legal services community.

### 3. Applicant's Capability to Accomplish Objectives

The applicant should detail its structure and staffing, past history with similar activities, and other work on behalf of the low-income individuals. Qualifications and experience of project participants and staff should be disclosed. A timetable for implementation of the project should also be included.

### 4. Community Involvement and Support

The applicant should state how the proposed activity will complement existing legal services delivery provided in its area. The extent to which a cooperative effort exists among law schools, legal services programs, community groups, local courts, and bar associations should be described. Current letters of support or other evidence of support may be included with the proposal.

### 5. Project Feasibility

The applicant should address the reasonableness of the proposed costs in terms of the benefits to be derived and the relationship to the project's overall goals.

Dated: February 2, 1995.

**Leslie Q. Russell,**

*Assistant to the Director, Office of Program Services.*

[FR Doc. 95-3040 Filed 2-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7050-01-P

## NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

### National Council on the Humanities; Meeting

February 1, 1995.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public L. 92-463, as amended) notice is hereby given that a meeting of the National Council on the Humanities will be held in Washington, DC on February 16-17, 1995.

The purpose of the meeting is to advise the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities with respect to policies, programs, and procedures for carrying out his

functions, and to review applications for financial support and gifts offered to the Endowment and to make recommendations thereon to the Chairman.

The meeting will be held in the Old Post Office Building, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. A portion of the morning and afternoon sessions on February 16-17, 1995, will not be open to the public pursuant to subsections (c)(4), (6) and (9)(B) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code because the Council will consider information that may disclose: Trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential; information of a personal nature the disclosure of which will constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; and information the disclosure of which would significantly frustrate implementation of proposed agency action. I have made this determination under the authority granted me by the Chairman's Delegation of Authority dated July 19, 1993.

The agenda for the sessions on February 16, 1995, will be as follows:

8:30-9:00 a.m. Coffee for Council Members—Room 527

#### Committee Meetings

(Open to the Public) Policy Discussion

9:00-10:00 a.m. Education Programs—Room M-14

Public Programs—Room 415

Research Programs—Room M07

Challenge Grants/Preservation and Access

& Interdivisional Technology—Room 315

Federal-State Partnership—Room 507

10:00 a.m. until Adjourned. (Closed to the Public) Discussion of specific grant applications before the Council

The morning session on February 17, 1995, will convene at 10:00 a.m., in the 1st Floor Council Room, M-09, and will be open to the public, as set out below. The agenda for the morning session will be as follows:

(Coffee for Staff and Council members will be served from 10:00-10:30 a.m.)

#### Minutes of the Previous Meeting

##### Reports

A. Introductory Remarks

B. Introduction of New Staff

C. Contracts Awarded in the Previous Quarter

D. Budget Reports

E. Legislative Report/Reauthorization

F. Committee Reports on Policy and General Matters

G. 1. Overview

2. Education Programs

3. Research Programs

4. Challenge Grants/Preservation and Access & Interdivisional Technology

5. Public Programs

6. Federal-State Partnership

7. Jefferson Lecture

(The meeting will be closed to the public at this point.)

The remainder of the proposed meeting will be given to the consideration of specific applications (closed to the public for the reasons stated above).

Further information about this meeting can be obtained from Mr. David C. Fisher, Advisory Committee Management Officer, Washington, DC 20506, or call area code (202) 606-8322, TDD (202) 606-8282. Advance notice of any special needs or accommodations is appreciated.

**David C. Fisher,**

*Advisory Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 95-3007 Filed 2-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7536-01-M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### DOE/NSF Nuclear Science Advisory Committee; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

*Name:* DOE/NSF Nuclear Science Advisory Committee.

*Date and Time:* February 24, 1995 from 8:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., February 25, 1995 from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

*Place:* Arlington Renaissance Hotel, Gallery II, 950 North Stafford Street, Arlington, VA 22203.

*Type of Meeting:* Open.

*Contact Person:* John W. Lightbody, Program Director for Nuclear Physics, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230, Telephone: (703) 306-1890.

*Minutes:* May be obtained from the contact person listed above.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To advise the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy on scientific priorities within the field of basic nuclear science research.

#### Agenda

February 24, 1995

- Discussion of Budgets and Status of DOE and NSF Nuclear Physics Programs (D. Hendrie, DOE; J. Lightbody, NSF)

- Presentation of Preliminary Subcommittee Report regarding Additional Capital Equipment for the RHIC Facility (C. Gelbke)

- Reports of Town Meetings of the Division of Nuclear Physics of the American Physical Society (by conveners)

February 25, 1995

- Discussion of Town Meeting Reports
- Progress Reports of the Long Range Plan Working Groups (LRPWG)

- Discussion of process and plans for full LRPWG Meeting

- Public Comment (\*)

(\*) Persons wishing to speak should make arrangements through the Contact Person identified above.

Dated: February 2, 1995.

**M. Rebecca Winkler,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 95-2947 Filed 2-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353]

### Philadelphia Electric Company; Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering two actions: (1) Issuance of an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, and (2) an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85, issued to Philadelphia Electric Company (the licensee), for operation of the Limerick Generating Station (LGS), Units 1 and 2, located in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant (1) an exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections II.H.4, III.C.2, and III.C.3, and (2) an amendment to change the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Limerick Generating Station (LGS), Units 1 and 2, in conjunction with the removal of the main steam isolation valve (MSIV) leakage control system (LCS) and the proposed use of an alternate leakage pathway.

10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections II.H.4 and III.C.2 require leak rate testing of MSIVs at the calculated peak containment pressure related to the design basis accident, and Section III.C.3 requires that the measured MSIV leak rates be included in the combined local leak rate test results. The proposed deletion of the MSIV LCS and proposed use of an alternate leakage pathway affects the description of an existing exemption (NUREG-0991, and its Supplement 3), which allows the leak rate testing of the MSIVs at a reduced pressure and allows exclusion of the measured MSIV leakage from the combined local leak rate test results.

The proposed TS amendment would permit an increase in the allowable MSIV leakage rate from 11.5 standard cubic feet per hour (scfh) to 100 scfh for any one MSIV and a combined maximum pathway leakage rate of 200 scfh for all four main steam lines, and would delete TS requirements for the currently installed MSIV LSC, because

the proposed system removal makes the TS inapplicable.

The proposed action for the TS amendments is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated January 14, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated August 1, October 25, December 13, and December 22, 1994; and the proposed action for the exemption is in accordance with the letter dated December 22, 1994.

#### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption is similar to the current exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections II.H.4 and III.C.2. The exemption is needed since the design of the MSIVs is such that testing in the reverse direction tends to unseat the valve and would result in a meaningless test. The total observed MSIV leak rate resulting from a leakage test where two MSIVs on one steam line are tested utilizing a reduced pressure (22 psig) will continue to be assigned to the penetration. The proposed exemption is also similar to the current exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.C.3. The licensee proposes that the MSIV leakage rate will continue to be accounted for separately in the radiological site analysis in accordance with the existing exemption. However, the existing exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.C.3 will not be applicable when the MSIV LCS is replaced with an Alternate Treatment Path (ATP) (main steam lines and condenser).

The proposed action regarding the TS amendment will reduce the need for repairs of the MSIVs, resolve concerns associated with the current LCS performance capability at high MSIV leakage rates, and provide an effective method for dealing with a potential MSIV leakage during a postulated loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA). Many boiling water reactors (BWRs) have difficulty meeting their MSIV leakage rate limits. Extensive repair, rework, and retesting efforts have negative effects on the outage costs and schedules, as well as significant impact on the licensee's as low as is reasonably achievable (ALARA) radiological exposure programs. The alternatives proposed by the licensee to deal with MSIV leakage make use of components (main steam lines and condenser) that are expected to remain intact and serviceable following a design basis LOCA.

#### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed actions related to the granting of an exemption